NOTE

This Microfiche meets the quality requirements of the American National Standard for Microfiche of Documents (ANSI PH5.9-1975). However, because of imperfections in the document from which it was made, it contains images that are illegible or difficult to read. The source document for this microfiche is the best copy that could be obtained prior to filming.

CIS Congressional Information Service
Washington, D.C.

[COMMITTEE PRINT]

101ST CONGRESS
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CSCE
101-1-5

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

ONE HUNDREDTH FIRST CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

THE LONDON INFORMATION FORUM OF THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE

COMPILATION OF SPEECHES

(APRIL 18, 1989–MAY 12, 1989)

Printed for the use of the
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1989

19951

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

J892-20

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

DENNIS DeCONCINI, Arizona, *Chairman*
STENY H. HOYER, Maryland, *Cochairman*

DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts
BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico
EDWARD FEIGHAN, Ohio
DON RITTER, Pennsylvania
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
JOHN EDWARD PORTER, Illinois
FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia
FRANK LAUTENBERG, New Jersey
TIMOTHY WIRTH, Colorado
WYCHE FOWLER, Georgia
HARRY REID, Nevada
ALFONSE M. D'AMATO, New York
JAMES McCLURE, Idaho
MALCOLM WALLOP, Wyoming

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

HON. RICHARD SCHIFTER, *Department of State*
HON. RONALD LEHMAN, *Department of Defense*
LOUIS LAUN, *Department of Commerce*

SAMUEL G. WISE, *Staff Director*
MARY SUE HAFNER, *Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel*
JANE S. FISHER, *Deputy Staff Director*

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

THE CSCE LONDON INFORMATION FORUM
April 18 - May 12, 1989

The London Information Forum was the first non-military follow-up activity to be held within the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe following the conclusion of the Vienna CSCE Review Meeting. The forum's aims, as mandated by the Vienna document, included examination of the circulation of, access to and exchange of information; cooperation in the field of information; and the improvement of working conditions for journalists.

The London Information Forum addressed fundamental human rights questions: the right to free expression and free choice of information sources. At issue were not only new initiatives in the exchange of information, but also improved compliance with existing CSCE commitments.

Ambassador Leonard H. Marks headed the U.S. delegation to the Forum and Mr. Rudolph Perina of the Department of State served as his deputy. The delegation was composed of representatives from the U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the United States Information Agency, the Department of State and the private sector. The latter included representatives from the U.S. print and broadcast media, film and publishing industries, academia, and other interested organizations who presented statements and proposals in their personal and professional capacities.

Following the open plenary sessions, the Forum divided into three Subsidiary Working Bodies. Subsidiary Working Bodies (SWBs) A and B focused working conditions for journalists. SWB-A also devoted attention to printed information, while SWB-B concentrated on filmed, broadcast and oral information. SWB-C covered communications in general, including the impact of new communications technology and copyright questions. All 21 sessions of the three working bodies were open to the accredited press and the public. Thus the London Information Forum achieved an unprecedented degree of openness.

In his closing remarks to the Forum on May 10, Ambassador Leonard Marks urged the delegates to view the Forum's closing not as "an end but a prelude to an era of greater understanding, reduced international tensions, and closer bonds among our societies." "Change," he noted, "is in the wind." The CSCE nations should embrace change as an "opportunity," not fear it as a "threat."

We share Ambassador Marks' view of the positive challenge changing communications hold for countries and citizens in the East and the West. The Forum was a valuable first step in assessing this newest CSCE challenge.

STENY H. HOYER
Co-Chairman

DENNIS DeCONCINI
Chairman

CONTENTS

Plenary Statements

	Page
Letter of Transmittal from Senator Dennis DeConcini, Chairman, and Congressman Steny H. Hoyer, Co-Chairman	iii
Opening address, Ambassador Leonard Marks, Chairman, U.S. Delegation, 4/21/89	3
Opening address, Bruce S. Gelb, Director, U.S. Information Agency, 4/21/89	11
Plenary statement, Ambassador Leonard Marks, 4/28/89	14
Plenary statement, Rudolph V. Perina, Deputy Chairman, U.S. Delegation, 5/5/89	16
Concluding statement, Ambassador Leonard Marks, 5/10/89	19

Subworking Group "A" Statements

Opening statement, Dana R. Bullen II, Executive Director, World Press Freedom Committee, 4/21/89	25
Statement on visa policy, Charles Perlik, second vice president, International Federation of Journalists, 4/25/89	29
Statement on the role of independent journalism, Leonard Sussman, senior scholar, International Communications Division, Freedom House, 4/26/89	32
Statement on reducing restrictions on importation of foreign materials, Ambassador Nicholas Veliotes, president, Association of American Publishers, 5/1/89	35
Statement, Judith Ingram, staff member, U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, 5/2/89	38
Statement on journalists working abroad, Gerald Warren, Editor, *San Diego Union*, 5/3/89	41
Statement on the need for free copying machines and desktop printers, Leonard Sussman, 5/5/89	44

Subworking Group "B" Statements

Statement on the goals of the U.S. Delegation, Rudolph V. Perina, 4/24/89	49
Statement, Daniel B. Smith, desk officer, U.S. Department of State, 4/26/89	51
Statement on Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, E. Eugene Pell, president, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, 4/26/89	53
Statement on freedom of the press, Murray Fromson, professor, Center for International Journalism, University of Southern California, 4/28/89	56
Statement on implementation of CSCE commitments, Ronald McNamara, staff member, U.S. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, 5/3/89	60
Statement of William T. Reed, senior vice president, Education Services, Public Broadcasting Service, 5/8/89	63

Subworking Group "C" Statements

Opening statement, John C. Thomson, policy officer, U.S. Information Agency, 4/24/89	69

Page

Statement on some principles for the new age of information technology, Leonard Sussman, 5/1/89 73

Closing statement issued by the U.S. Delegation to the CSCE London Information Forum, 5/12/89 76

PLENARY STATEMENTS

U.S. Delegation to the CSCE Information Forum

Opening Plenary Statement of the Honorable Leonard H. Marks

Chairman, U.S. Delegation to the CSCE Information Forum

London, April, 1989

As Prepared
for Delivery

Mr. Chairman:

I would like to join previous speakers in thanking the people and government of the United Kingdom for their gracious hospitality as hosts of this Forum.

At the outset I support the position of other delegations who want to avoid confrontation. We can disagree – and we shall on many issues – but there is no reason to be disagreeable. We have come to this forum to exchange views on how to implement the commitments made in the Helsinki Final Act and the Madrid and Vienna documents. We are prepared to discuss formally and informally issues in a frank and candid manner. The stage is now set for all delegations to engage in an open and spirited discussion on some of the most vital components of the CSCE process.

To illustrate the importance that we attach to this meeting, I now turn to a statement by President George Bush on the opening of the Information Forum which we have distributed to all delegations and from which I would like to quote in part:

> Quote: "Two hundred years ago, our founding fathers considered freedom of speech so critical to America's new democracy that they made it the subject of our constitution's first amendment. They could not have anticipated a world of videocassettes or instantaneous satellite communications. But they did know something about the force of democratic ideas and the citizen's inalienable rights. When the Helsinki Final Act was signed in 1975, we already had entered the information age. Yet, the wisdom of America's first statesmen has stood the test of time. Open societies where ideas, people and information flow freely are societies best equipped to meet the challenges of any age - and particularly one of rapid technological change, like ours. Unquote.

Our objective at the Forum is to further the free flow of information. But, isn't it anachronistic that our discussions outside of the plenary are "closed to the press?" I'm aware that the CSCE process governs the procedure here, but I strongly urge that future meetings be open to the public and to the press. If the public has a "right to know," why should our deliberations not be accessible to those who have the greatest stake in them?

Our deliberations, Mr. Chairman, will be viewed with great interest by our publics. The Forum provides a timely opportunity to assess the gains made in Vienna. The Vienna Concluding Document represents the fullest expression to date of the original pledges our governments made to each other and to our citizens in Helsinki. The nature of that document mirrors the importance all our governments and peoples attach to improving East-West relations. Its extensive new provisions regarding information were possible in large part because there is growing recognition on the part of some Eastern governments that closing off one's society to a world of information means closing its own doors to the future.

The public gains its information essentially, though not exclusively, from the printed press, radio and television. In democratic societies, all points of view are presented by independent journalists. Under our system, a journalist is free to criticize official authorities or public activities. Under the authoritarian government, a journalist is a servant of the state charged with the duty of presenting governmental views, not to challenge them.

Under our system, the government does not speak for the press, and the press does not speak for the government. Our media report the facts, but do not act as an instrument of governmental policy. In his statement, Deputy Minister Petrovski of the USSR illustrates this difference by stating:

> "The mass media are a most important instrument of glasnost."

If, indeed, the mass media is an instrument of glasnost, and glasnost, I understand, is Soviet policy, then I can only conclude that the mass media are an instrument of Soviet policy.

In free societies a free press is not an instrument of any government, nor of any policy nor of any political movement. It is not, and must not, be an instrument of any institution.

While our principles therefore are profoundly different, we must, nevertheless, work together to carry out CSCE commitments by removing barriers to the free flow of information under either system.

Mr. Chairman, it has long been recognized by democratic governments that freedom of speech and of the press are the lifeblood of free and independent states. Without a well-informed citizenry, democracy cannot survive. And that is why my government views the individual and his rights as central to the entire Helsinki process. True security and cooperation among our countries cannot exist, let alone flourish, without respect for the rights of the individual. At the heart of the Helsinki process is the individual's "right to know" as well as "to act upon" fundamental freedoms.

What does the "right to know" mean? It means that a citizen has the basic right to make informed decisions about his or her personal life and society. State-imposed obstacles to the free flow of ideas, information and people restrict the citizen's ability to make such decisions. That is why in the United States we believe in placing as few limitations as possible on freedom of speech and the press. And that is why the information and communications fields in our country are chiefly a private sector enterprise.

The composition of our delegation reflects this. Our delegates to the Forum will include distinguished private sector participants from film, broadcasting, publishing, journalism, education, and other professions deeply concerned with freedom of expression. They will express their views-- not those of the U.S. Government -- and they do so without censorship, or fear of official reprisal.

In evaluating compliance, I hope that we will criticize where there has been no effort to comply, but also acknowledge positive steps to meet the clear responsibilities set out almost fourteen years ago in Helsinki.

For example, we welcome the cessation of jamming of the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty broadcasts. That's a step forward -- but let me stress that jamming is not only contrary to Basket III, it is a clear violation of the regulations of the International Telecommunications Union and of Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Jamming is reprehensible and not appropriate conduct for a civilized nation. I hope that jamming is a phenomenon that will not recur. I trust that we recognize that this practice is inconsistent with Helsinki commitments and a violation of the public's "right to know."

We urge that radio jamming devices be dismantled, just as we are now dismantling categories of nuclear weapons, to demonstrate that they will never be used to intimidate again.

Other steps taken in Poland and Hungary -- and to some degree in the Soviet Union -- toward greater tolerance of freedom of expression and information are encouraging and positive developments. We hope they will continue and become irreversible. But we also see with deep concern the rigid controls on information still prevailing in Romania, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, and Bulgaria.

In the Soviet Union, exercise of the citizen's "right to know" takes the form of new efforts to fill in the so-called "blank spots" of history. Freedom of expression appears to have been given wide scope during the recent elections. At the same time, however, a new decree increasing the criminal penalties for operating a copying machine without official sanction is a step very much in the wrong direction.

In Poland, we see some very encouraging developments. Solidarity and the Government have reached groundbreaking agreements which should permit Polish citizens to make informed choices on the pressing issues facing their country. Likewise, in Hungary, the Central Committee recently announced that it has called for legislation "to give scope to all views that do not contravene the Constitution and laws of the country." Presumably, this would allow individuals or parties to establish independent newspapers, radio and television stations. We look forward at this Forum to learning more about the reform programs underway in these countries.

In Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, on the other hand, the light of reform has yet to shine. Jiri Wolf, a Charter '77 signatory, has been imprisoned since May 1983 for writing an expose of prison conditions and attempting to send the material abroad. The world-renowned playwright Vaclav Havel has been imprisoned in part on charges that he sought to incite disturbances through foreign radio broadcasts.

In Bulgaria, the independent Discussion Club for the Support of Glasnost and Perestroika has met with repression from authorities since its founding last November. And, in the GDR authorities continue to practice strict censorship in an effort to ensure that dissenting views appear only rarely in the media.

Finally, in Romania, in direct violation of Vienna commitments, foreign journalists have been ill-treated while three Romanian journalists remain under arrest for allegedly producing a leaflet critical of the government. Our repeated requests for information about these journalists have been denied.

This brief survey indicates that much remains to be done to fulfill the promise of the Vienna commitments. And there is much that all countries can do in a cooperative spirit to improve the East-West flow of ideas and people in the information age.

The information revolution is expanding globally and inevitably embraces East and West alike. European television viewers are on the threshhold of an era in which they can choose from numerous channels which do not heed national boundaries. As in other areas in international life, technological advances in the information and communications fields penetrate the traditional borders of the nation state, affecting political relationships, policies and diplomatic methods, as the participants and the structure of this multilateral Forum so aptly attest.

The Forum can provide an opportunity for exploring cooperative efforts to enhance the flow of East-West information in this exciting new age.

But, as we hail the technological advances, we must remember that the tools of science are only helpful when they are applied to serve mankind and not when they are used to perfect the instruments of popular control. During our London Forum, we will be hearing a lot about the new technology. But mankind has yet to perfect an instrument to equal the power of a human voice speaking the truth.

That's where freedom and democracy start and end. What happens to that voice tells more about how governments live up to their international commitments than a lengthy Concluding Document ever can. And it is the record of this, Mr. Chairman, that we should focus on in our deliberations.

In the few minutes I have left, I would - with your permission, Mr. Chairman - like to give the floor to the Honorable Bruce Gelb, newly-appointed Director of the United States Information Agency. Mr. Gelb has a long and distinguished career in business and has devoted a considerable part of his adult life to foreign affairs issues. This is his first public appearance before an international Forum since taking his oath three days ago. It is indeed a privilege to introduce a distinguished colleague who will briefly address some of his ideas on how East-West communications can be improved.

- oOo -

U.S. Delegation
to the
CSCE Information Forum

Opening Statement of the Honorable Bruce S. Gelb
Director, U.S. Information Agency to the CSCE Information Forum
London, April 1989

As Prepared
For Delivery

Ambassador Marks, thank you for your very gracious introduction. Mr. Chairman, I cannot think of a more appropriate setting to commence my directorship of the United States Information Agency.

From its inception, my organization has concerned itself with one fundamental goal -- to foster mutual understanding and respect among world citizens. For over 40 years, we have encouraged and supported the exchange of information, ideas, and people with nearly every country in the world.

Just 14 years ago, the people of North America and Europe moved toward a similar goal when they signed the unprecedented Helsinki Final Act. As we seek greater assurances of security and cooperation, through the CSCE process, mutual understanding and respect seem more and more within the realm of possibility.

And yet, when we talk about the need to encourage cooperation between the East and West, what do we mean? Is it just a fresh layer of words heaped upon old promises, or are we serious about a more stable East-West relationship?

19-951 0 - 89 - 2

How do we encourage cooperation between East and West? Among many different politically, socially and economically diverse societies? Among people who have not communicated routinely for over four decades?

We are very fortunate that such a daunting task falls to one of the most creative, dynamic and resourceful populations in the world. For it is here, in the CSCE membership, that we find the cradle of Western civilization. Sitting among us today, are the descendants of those societies which gave us artistic beauty, modern science and technology, and democratic ideas.

Unfortunately, many barriers do exist among this extraordinary blend of cultures. For some, routine access to foreign newspapers, magazines, films and broadcasts is still considered a special privilege. For others, regular and routine personal and professional contacts with citizens from other countries is impossible.

If we want to share in the many benefits awaiting greater communication and exchange of ideas, we must take steps to know one another better. Through knowledge comes a more balanced picture of other cultures. Negative stereotypes thrive in uninformed minds. Misperceptions and misunderstandings flourish in half truths and ignorance.

Since the signing of the Helsinki Final Act, some positive signs have already been noted. Cessation of jamming against Western broadcasters by East Europe removes a serious barrier to information flow. We welcome the legislation newly announced in Hungary granting individuals and groups the right to establish independent print and electronic media. We applaud the agreement in Poland granting to independent groups a greater degree of access to the media.

But we look forward to seeing greater movement toward independent control and access to the media within the CSCE family. We want to see libraries, reading rooms, and cultural centers open to all who are interested. We hope that exchanges and contacts become more flexible and less official. We encourage your people to become familiar with our writers, filmmakers, poets, and politicians -- and we seek the same in return. We want to see greater cooperation between East and West.

Looking backward for just a minute, well before the era of telecommunications, computers, and satellite transmissions, our second president, John Adams, put us on notice when he said, "Let us...cherish, therefore, the means of knowledge. Let us dare to read, think, speak, and write... Let every sluice of knowledge be opened and set a-flowing."

Now we are poised on the dawn of a new age in communications. For the first time in the history of the human race, technology is capable of carrying to every man, woman and child the unvarnished truth about the world within and beyond their reach. It is ours for the asking -- let us not settle for anything less.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

U.S. Delegation
to the
CSCE Information Forum

Statement of Leonard Marks
Plenary Intervention
28 April 1989

Check Against Delivery

Mr. Chairman, we have now reached the halfway point in our discussions. I think it appropriate that today we take stock of what we have accomplished and what remains to be done.

First, I want to express my delegation's appreciation for the candor and thoughtfulness demonstrated by delegates in the subsidiary working bodies. The discussions generally have been of a high caliber, and we hope the next two weeks' deliberations will continue at the same level.

We have been encouraged also by the unanimous decision of each working group to open its sessions to the press and public. This act is more than merely a gesture; it reflects our joint determination to make the free flow of information and ideas within and among countries a reality.

The creative and spirited exchange of views between the many non-governmental participants in this Forum has lent sharp focus to our discussions. These delegates bring a breadth of experience and perspective to our discussions, and many have raised fundamental questions to which we must seek answers.

In the area of openness and non-governmental participation, then, we can already point to the success of this Forum. The subject matter at hand lends itself particularly well to wide participation and attendance. By bringing Eastern and Western journalists and communications experts into direct, face-to-face discussions, the Forum has already made a valuable contribution to the CSCE process.

We have not come close to exhausting our mandate from Vienna. Until now, we have centered our discussions largely on journalists, their experiences and needs. As key consumers and disseminators of information, they deserve our attention. But the Information Forum mandate includes a number of other, equally important items which affect wide swathes of our populations, including access to printing equipment, libraries and cultural information centers, and the importance of books and films in information exchange.

Moreover, several of the most crucial information provisions of the Vienna Concluding Document have not been aired fully. I am speaking of fundamental freedoms: the right of minorities to receive, exchange and disseminate printed or broadcast material in their own languages; the right of believers to import and

distribute religious materials; and the right of all individuals to chose their sources of information freely.

Despite the CSCE commitments willingly undertaken by governments, there are millions of individuals who are denied the right to use their own languages freely, to uphold and pass on their ethnic heritage and religious faith, and to broaden their exposure to and testing of ideas. My delegation intends to return to these vital information provisions at this forum.

During the past two weeks we have heard many delegates urge fewer constraints on the free flow of information. Among the many issues which have been raised are:

-- eliminating restrictions on the electronic transmission of news reporting;

-- permitting use of host-country currencies to pay in-country expenses; and

-- removing all barriers to the importation of foreign printed materials.

The American delegation certainly believes that cooperative projects ought to be encouraged and expanded. But multilateral cooperation can not replace action on the part of each state, as mandated in Vienna, to bring national laws and practice into conformity with CSCE provisions. Our discussions here at best can serve as an impetus to greater compliance; they are not in themselves a subsitute for it.

Removal of those laws and cessation of those practices inconsistent with CSCE commitments are imperative if we are to make the goals embodied in Helsinki a viable and meaningful standard -- one that will guide relations among states, and between states and citizens.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

U.S. Delegation
to the
CSCE Information Forum

Plenary Statement Delivered By
Mr. Rudolf V. Perina
Deputy Chairman, U.S. Delegation

May 5, 1989

Mr. Chairman, we have now completed the third week of our deliberations and stand at the threshold of formulating for ourselves, our publics and our governments what we have accomplished. We have spent many hours debating the specifics of visa laws, journalists' rights, direct and indirect censorship, and the bewildering implications of new media technology. It was important for us to deal with these issues, for they are crucial to the complex process of information flow among and within nations. But we hope, Mr. Chairman, that our focus on these matters has not swayed us to forget the fundamental reasons for this Forum, and to why we are all gathered here.

Our mandate has ostensibly been to discuss information flow and exchange, but "information" is a value-free commodity, a resource which at least all governments covet, whether they share this resource with their publics or not. What makes information an asset to some and a danger for others is that it serves as the raw material for something much more potent -- for ideas. Indeed, at the heart of our debate is the distinction between governments which seek to control ideas in their societies and governments which see a free competition of ideas as a source of strength and vigor. There can be no clearer distinction between a closed society and an open one.

Our delegation has sometimes highlighted differences between our countries at this Forum because we see this as the first and necessary step to narrowing them. But I assure you that we do not overlook the importance of converging views. Indeed, that is what I would like to focus on this morning.

I recall that last week at this time the distinguished delegate of the Soviet Union pointed out that we should not resist certain differences among us, just as Henry Higgins was wrong to lament "Why can't a woman be more like a man?" The results of such differences he noted, can be among the most productive and creative. It was a clever analogy, and a seductive one. But perhaps it did not go far enough. Indeed, the relationships which are based solely on the differences between a man and a woman tend to be of a transitory benefit, and generally among those which we would least like to see

recorded for posterity. The relationships, on the other hand, which tend to be the most durable and to preserve the species are those based on a certain communality of values, a communality which gives a relationship the strength to go through good times and bad, through sickness and through health.

Mr. Chairman, I will show the wisdom not to pursue this analogy further, except to say that this communality of values is essential between individuals as well as between nations -- particularly if they seek to live in a common home.

We have heard a number of references at this meeting to a common European home. It is perhaps worthwhile to stop and ask ourselves what such a phrase means. We Americans are a nation of immigrants. To us neither a house, nor necessarily a continent, is a home. Rather, home is a state of mind -- a place where one feels secure, at ease with one's neighbors, and free in the fullest sense of the word. The same applies to nations as well as individuals. Indeed, the great legacy of this continent is that it has developed over the last 2000 years -- at sometimes enormous human cost -- a vision of mankind's dignity and worth which spreads far beyond the geographical confines of a few European states.

It is this vision, Mr. Chairman, that was taken by European immigrants to the New World. It is this vision that has bound North Americans and Europeans for more than two centuries. And it is this vision -- philosophical, moral and spiritual -- that is spreading around the world more forcefully and more vigorously than at any time in this century. And it is this vision which forms the unstated context of all that we have been discussing at this Forum.

A home cannot truly be such if it has impenetrable walls -- whether of concrete and barbed wire, or the more subtle walls which prevent contact and communication among its inhabitants. And a home requires a certain communality of values -- not that everyone be the same, but rather that at least there be a shared vision on that which is most important: on the worth of the individual, on fundamental, inalienable freedoms, and on having the opportunity to exchange ideas freely among ourselves and among our peoples.

To dismantle such walls and to build this common vision is what we have been discussing at this Forum. We recognize that achieving these goals is a daunting task, which cannot be achieved overnight, or in four weeks, or in some cases perhaps in a lifetime. But we must persist in our efforts, and we are particularly heartened by the remarkable progress which has been achieved in relations with some Eastern countries in recent years.

I often recall nowadays a trip I made to an Eastern country some years ago during which a prominent human rights advocate explained to me the existential difference between an aquarium and fish soup.

The essential ingredients of both are the same, he wisely pointed out, but there is one important difference: you can turn an aquarium into fish soup, but you cannot turn fish soup back into an aquarium. And if you get fish soup, and insist on calling it your aquarium, people will look at you oddly.

The man was expressing his very pessimistic assessment of the possibilities for change and reform in his society, which indeed was a rather murky chowder of tense political gridlock, economic disarray, and deep alienation between the government and the people. I left convinced that, indeed, a fish soup could not be turned into an aquarium.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to say that the country I visited is represented at this Forum and has been among those Eastern countries speaking most openly and courageously about the changes it wishes to introduce, and in some cases already has. There is no doubt that the road ahead is a long one, and may be a painful one, but there appears to be a genuine commitment to lower the walls and agree on a basic set of beliefs which should threaten neither side, and benefit the peoples of both. I don't believe the gentleman I spoke to would today use his aquarium analogy. I have vowed to examine fish soup closely in any restaurant.

The lesson I think is that we should not underestimate the potential for change in any society which makes a genuine commitment to it. And we Americans do not. We are a society accustomed to change -- for the most part, we think, to the better. We hope that the ideas expressed at this Forum will help to make us an even better CSCE partner. But we also hope that the countries which still tenaciously resist change will look at their neighbors -- indeed will look at the world -- and recognize that the future bears no bounty for a closed society. The information age, the age of openness, has arrived.

U.S. Delegation
to the
CSCE Information Forum

Closing Statement by Leonard H. Marks
Chairman, U.S. Delegation to the CSCE Information Forum

May 10, 1989

As prepared for delivery

As the London Information Forum nears its end, we can take pride in our achievements.

Much was accomplished, but much more remains to be done to realize the commitments we made in Helsinki, Madrid and Vienna.

We come away with a firmer resolve to enlarge the means by which information travels between East and West.

And we come away with a sharper vision of the world we aspire to create for ourselves and our children.

We hope the close of this Forum is not an end but a prelude to an era of greater understanding, reduced international tensions, and closer bonds among our societies. Indeed, all of us leave London enriched by personal ties that developed during the course of our work here.

Mr. Chairman, change is in the wind. The growing thrust toward democracy reminds us of what men and women can accomplish when their minds are free to explore all areas of knowledge -- unrestricted by arbitrary constraints on information.

Change is before us. We feel it. Diversity is no longer a pretext for criticism, but a key to greater understanding.

Change is no longer viewed as a threat, but an opportunity. It is not to be feared, but welcomed. The power of these changes could be felt throughout the Forum.

The high quality of our dialogue here has been matched by the professional tone of our exchanges. Open and frank discussions have replaced confrontation.

We examined in detail participating states' records of implementation of CSCE principles. We did this in an honest, forthright manner. Where we disagreed, we said so.

But, Mr. Chairman, we did more. Despite our differences, all of us listened. And we showed respect. Not just in a pro forma, diplomatic manner. But in a way that enhances dignity.

We know that no country, political system, or particular group has a monopoly on truth. Our cultural backgrounds are different. We speak different languages; but we share a common heritage -- the desire of the human race to survive and to be free in a peaceful world.

As changes occur, as diversity is appreciated, as our comprehension of other societies expands, trust grows.

And it is trust, Mr. Chairman, that is the foundation on which our framework for the free flow of information rests.

It was the Greek philosopher Aeschylus who said: "For somehow this is tyranny's disease, to trust no friends."

When this conference began, many felt it would achieve little.

How wrong the cynics were.

We have heard some astounding proposals from countries that only a few years ago would not have countenanced what we in the West consider the free expression of ideas.

Let me list some of the accomplishments of this conference:

1. We met in an open forum. Members of the press and other private sector representatives took part in all deliberations. I am proud to have suggested this fundamental change and honored that other states supported this move.

That's a big step forward that will hopefully serve as a guideline in satisfying the public's right to know. This unprecedented decision demonstrated our intent to breathe life into our Vienna commitment to ensure the "freest and widest dissemination of information."

Equally important was the inclusion of experts in the field of information. They have firmly grounded our discussions in the here-and-now of their working experiences, and several of their proposals merit follow-up by our governments.

2. The fact that journalists from the participating states exchanged views is, in and of itself, an accomplishment. An abundance of refreshing, new, and practical ideas emerged from the working groups. They are reflected in the list of proposals that will be submitted to Helsinki in 1992.

Throughout the conference we heard the universal complaint that delays in issuing visas and burdensome travel restrictions impede the free flow of information.

Accordingly, I shall recommend to the Secretary of State that the U.S. Government re-examine our own policies in this area. I am mindful that national security considerations must be taken into account. But I believe it is time for the U.S. to take a fresh look at these procedures.

3. During our deliberations, we had bilateral conversations with countries from Eastern Europe to discuss mutual problems. Let me refer to one: currency nonconvertibility. In informal discussions with the Soviet Union, we found them to be responsive, in principle, to our proposal to permit inconvertible sales proceeds earned by foreign media organizations to be used for their in-country expenses. We look forward to follow-up conversations regarding this initiative.

4. There has been a growing recognition that technological developments have made instantaneous communications possible in all parts of the world. Satellites, cable link-ups, and advanced transmission means have bridged chasms which geography created and political leaders have made permanent. Any two points on the globe are now instantly in touch.

Yet, we have not taken advantage of some of these developments because of a lack of cooperation between governments. These impediments can and must be removed.

Mr. Chairman, I have highlighted a few of our achievements. We must not be misled, however, into believing that our job is done.

Some countries have failed to abide by the Spirit of Helsinki. Their restrictions on the free flow of information retard progress rather than further it.

Fortunately, there are encouraging signs that a better future depends on pluralism in all aspects of life. For example, Hungary and Poland are easing the way for citizens of divergent views to participate in a meaningful way in political and social life. The Soviet Union, too, is embarking on this road, and we hope it will go far along it.

The presentations made here by the Hungarian, Polish, and Soviet delegations, as well as the variety of perspectives represented by their delegates, are a step in the right direction. We welcome these changes and encourage them.

We have set the stage here for such joint undertakings through both the content and form of our meetings. Our wide-ranging and intense discussions examined many of these areas where mutual efforts could be productive.

In conclusion, my delegation joins me in thanking the Secretariat staff for their outstanding support throughout the Forum. They and our British hosts made our stay in this magnificent city a truly memorable experience.

Finally, my sincere thanks to the interpreters who -- as much as anyone at this conference -- have made a significant, and tangible contribution to the free flow of information.

SUBWORKING GROUP A STATEMENTS

Statement of Dana Bullen
Private Sector Advisor
U.S. Delegation to the London Information Forum

Subworking Group A
21 April, 1989

Thank you, Chairman:

At this first opportunity, I should like to say a welcome to the many journalists who I understand are members of various delegations. I have said many times that it is journalists who should discuss journalistic issues -- and here we are.

The U.S. delegation, of which I am a private-sector member, also includes journalists for this meeting, and I am from that background.

After college and military service, I was for 23 years a reporter and editor with newspapers in Washington. For the Washington Star, where I worked for 21 years, I was first a local news reporter, then a criminal court reporter, U.S. Senate reporter, a columnist, assistant news editor and, for 6 years, the foreign news editor.

Many of us here have experienced the practical problems of practicing journalism. I have had colleagues killed on foreign assignment, expelled from countries, denied work permits and all the rest. So have many of you, I am sure.

All the journalists I know try to act responsibly. I am sure it is the same in your countries. But this idea of "responsibility" is different in different places. In half the world, it is "responsible" to follow a story wherever it goes. In the other half, it is "responsible" to drop a story the instant it seems to be going in the wrong direction, or in what somebody in power thinks is a "wrong" direction.

This is why we can do constructive work here in seeking to lower barriers for the free practice of journalism, for freedom of expression generally. But it also shows why we would make a big mistake if we tried to set out principles for journalists to follow. The views are too far apart.

I would not wish you to set rules for me, and you would not want me to set rules for you. So we should best discuss other things.

We are fortunate that the Vienna document's section on information is -- if its authors are in the room, I compliment them -- really very good. I think we really might take its provisions, calling for a "freer and wider" flow of information and see how well we are doing this. I hope you will note that

the language of the Vienna document is a "freer and wider" dissemination of information, not any idea of a "balanced" flow. Free and balanced are opposites -- and Vienna picked the right one.

As news happens, it should be reported. News does not happen evenly, or on schedule. Vienna set the right approach, in calling for "access" to all sources, speedy visas (the multiple entry kind, please), and availability of the technical means to do this job quickly and without hindrance.

It is not true that conditions for journalists are the same everywhere, and I regret this.

We in the United States are constantly reminded that one of the cruelest abuses against journalists is physical violence and jail. As you all know, the AP's bureau chief in the Middle East has been held by kidnappers for over 4 years now. A British journalist is similarly a hostage there.

In CSCE countries, there are not many cases in which journalists are in jail -- but it still does happen. A recent report by the New York Committee to Protect Journalists lists 66 journalists in jail around the world at present. Among CSCE countries, there are 10 listed. These are: Czechoslovakia, 5; Romania, 3; and the Soviet Union, 2.

In the latest newsletter of the International Federation of Journalists, of Brussels, even a difference between Eastern European countries in these regards stands out. On the same page of the IFJ newsletter, it is noted that while Poland seems about to re-legalize the Polish Association of Journalists, three Romanian journalists were arrested there on Jan. 27 of this year for circulating a leaflet, and nothing is known of their fate since then.

It is necessary to mention such things. It shows the distance we must go together to implement the Vienna accords -- for everyone, for all forms of expression, East and West, everywhere.

I have no new proposals to offer at this time. A longstanding and very humane one is that all journalists in detention of any kind be immediately freed. I think one of my concerns is that we do not, by accident, come up with new ideas to "implement" the Vienna accords that could, in practice, undermine them.

Let's join in supporting the freest, widest flow of news and information of which we are capable.

Thank you.

U.S. Delegation to the London Information Forum
Subworking Group A
21 April 1989

IMPRISONED JOURNALISTS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA, ROMANIA AND THE SOVIET UNION

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Petr Cibulka was detained on October 14, 1988 for distributing a petition concerning the death of Pavel Wonka in prison, duplicating the independently published and disseminated periodical "Informace o Charte" and "hoarding" the independent publication "Lidove Noviny." He was charged with "preparing defamation of the nation, a race, or conviction" (Penal Code, Paragraph 198). Additional charges of incitement (Paragraph 100), speculation (Paragraph 117/1/2) and operating an unauthorized business venture (Paragraph 118/1) were added on October 27, 1988. Cibulka, who is being held in Brno-Bohunice prison, faces 3 to 10 years imprisonment.

Tomas Dvorak, an editor of the Independent Peace Association bulletin, was detained on October 22, 1988 for preparing and distributing leaflets calling for a demonstration on October 28, 1988, the seventieth anniversary of the founding of Czechoslovakia. He was sentenced to 10 months in prison, suspended for 30 months, for "preparation to incitement," and is being held in prison pending a prosecution appeal of the sentence. He faces up to three years in prison.

Ivan Jirous, editor of the independent journal "Vokno," was detained on October 20, 1988 and charged with "incitement" (Paragraph 100) and "harming the interests of the Republic abroad" (Paragraph 112) in connection with a petition he and Jiri Tichy circulated in Summer 1988 criticizing the Government for the death of prisoner of conscience Pavel Wonka and other injustices. Jirous was sentenced on March 9, 1989 to 16 months imprisonment, while Tichy received a six-month prison sentence.

Hana Marvanova, an editor of the Independent Peace Association bulletin, was detained on October 28, 1988 and charged with "preparation to incitement" for writing leaflets which authorities judged to be "creating distrust in the role of the Czechoslovak Communist Party." She was sentenced to 10 months in prison, suspended for 30 months, and is being held in prison pending a prosecution appeal of the sentence. She faces up to three years in prison.

Frantisek Starek, a Charter 77 signatory and chief editor of the independent magazine "Vokno," was arrested February 23, 1989 and reportedly charged with "incitement." He is in detention in Hradec Kralove, and may face up to 6 months imprisonment or a fine of 20,000 Czechoslovak crowns or both. At the time of his arrest,

police confiscated two vans-ful of independently published literature and printing equipment.

ROMANIA

Petre Mihai Bacanu and Anton Uncu, reporters with the "Romania Libera" newspaper, and Mihai Creanga, theater critic with "Romania Pitoreasca" magazine, as well as several "Romania Libera" printers, were arrested in late January 1989 for allegedly producing a mass-distribution leaflet critical of the Romanian regime. Their trial on charges of "defaming the Socialist state" is reportedly imminent. Their whereabouts and condition are unknown. The Romanian Government has rebuffed all attempts to learn of their fate.

SOVIET UNION

Vyacheslav Degtyarev, Gorky correspondent for the "Express-Chronicle" independent journal, has been charged with draft evasion under Article 80 for refusing to serve in the army. It is believed he has been targeted in reprisal for his samizdat publishing activities. On January 16, 1989, Degtyarev was forcibly brought to a psychiatric clinic for examination and released after three hours. On February 15, Degtyarev was taken again to Kashchenko Psychiatric Hospital No. 1 for treatment, and is believed to be there still.

Sergei Kuznetsov, Sverdlovsk correspondent for the "Glasnost" independent journal, was arrested on December 11, 1988 and charged with "defamation" for distributing pamphlets denouncing local authorities. He was also charged with "resisting a policeman" while being arrested. After a one-month evaluation in a psychiatric hospital, he is presently believed to be in prison for interrogation, facing charges under Article 30, personal slander.

U.S. Delegation
to the
CSCE Information Forum

Statement of Charles A. Perlik, Jr.
Private Sector Advisor
U.S. Delegation to the London Information Forum

Subworking Group A
25 April 1989

Mr. Chairman, my name is Charles Perlik and I am a private sector advisor to the U.S. delegation to this forum. Before my retirement last year I was president of the trade union representing journalists in the United States and Canada.

I share the concerns raised so far at this forum on visa policies. We feel that this is an area in which every country represented here could probably stand to make some improvements, ours included. For instance, no American journalist has received a journalist visa abroad to enter Romania in the past year, and receiving a visa on the border is by no means a certainty.

The Czechoslovak Government has long refused to grant multiple-entry visas, even to accredited correspondents. I understand that the U.S. Government has raised this issue on numerous occasions, and has received assurances that the Czechoslovak Government will bring its practices into compliance with its CSCE obligations.

In regard to the Soviet Union, I would like to quote a relevant paragraph from a document entitled "Expanding Glasnost" prepared this month by the Moscow Correspondents' Association, which has carried out a detailed survey involving past and present correspondents representing the U.S. media.

> "Particularly at times of urgent news, journalists need to be able to enter the Soviet Union fast. They should be able to get a visa good for at least a few days simply by presenting their credentials at Sheremetyevo Airport. If the Soviet government cannot permit that, it should at least assure that a journalist can get a visa within 24 hours from any Soviet consulate."

The Soviet Union imposes strict ceilings on the numbers of U.S. journalists allowed to visit the Soviet Union at any one time. American journalists -- whether visiting or resident in the U.S.S.R. -- are restricted from visiting some 80 percent of the territory of the U.S.S.R. and can normally visit only 115 cities served by Intourist. As we have heard already at this forum, several normally open areas have been closed off to

foreign journalists because of real or perceived "unrest."

Mr. Chairman, regarding U.S. visa policies, I believe that a basic premise of our system is that there is no need to erect any barriers in the marketplace of ideas. Obviously the best defense against a bad idea is a good idea -- not a censored idea. To exclude an individual, including a journalist, because of his or her ideas is to limit the free flow of public information. The U.S. has been subjected to criticism of its visa law, particulary the McCarron-Walter Act. I only want to point out that the U.S. Congress has explicitly stated through law that no visa shall be denied based on mere political beliefs, statements or associations. There are some exceptions to this prohibition, and I can assure you that they are hotly debated. This is the law in the United States currently.

There is much debate within the Congress about repealing or at best revising certain sections of the McCarron-Walter Act. This issue is taken very seriously by the American people and it is my hope that our government will respond by imposing fewer limitations under which individuals or groups may enter the U.S.

Mr. Chairman, earlier I referred to "Expanding Glasnost," a very thoughtful statement prepared by the Moscow Correspondents Association this month regarding the working conditions for journalists in the Soviet Union. In short, that statement says nations should cease using journalists and journalism as instruments of national public policy. Many of the suggestions it contains are applicable to <u>all</u> of our countries, and copies of it are freely available.

One of the most valuable points it contains I think, is echoed in the United Kingdom pages suggestion that "the foreign media shall be free to employ nationals of the host country by private selection and without restriction." I think this notion enjoys broad support among U.S. journalists as well, and is a worthwhile point for further discussion. As a journalist, I believe that one important criterion in the search for fairness and accuracy is the ability to hire local staff, unhindered by government bureaus which claim the right to pass on such hirings.

Mr. Chairman, the environment in which journalists work tells us a great deal about how governments view information. For those that prefer it closely held by the few away from the many, it becomes an instrument of control. For others, it is a fundamental human right, neither an instrument of control nor a privelege.

At one extreme, there is no such thing as a private source of news. According to Romania's still unpublished Decree 408, citizens are required to report all contacts with foreigners to police. Security is so pervasive in that country that our so-called 'contacts' can expect to be interrogated after talking to foreign journalists. And foreign journalists can also expect to

be interrogated and expelled from the country.

The danger for Czechoslovak citizens in granting interviews to Western reporters was underscored in the February trial of Czechoslovak playwright Vaclav Havel, when the state used as evidence against him his interviews with Radio Free Europe and the BBC to support charges of incitement in connection with the Jan Palach commemoration in January of this year. At another demonstration, in September 1988, security police injured Reuter correspondent Michael Wise.

There have been instances in the GDR of police roughing up journalists and breaking or damaging equipment. This last occurred in June 1988 when the Western press attempted to cover a spontaneous gathering of rock music fans at the Brandenburg Gate during an outdoor concert in the West.

Significant improvements in working conditions for journalists have occurred in the Soviet Union in the past year or two. But those improvements have by no means been made permanent. David Shipler, former Moscow correspondent for the New York Times and now a Senior Associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, has pointed out, and I quote,

> "(T)he improvements are only as durable as the policy (of glasnost) itself, susceptible to contradiction by individuals in authority, especially at the local level in outlying areas." End quote.

These practices run counter to the Vienna Concluding Document provision which provides for the freedom of journalists "to seek access to and maintain contacts with public and private sources of information" and for professional confidentiality.

I think the Vienna Document is very clear in its intent and its meaning. What is necessary at this point is for governments to remove decrees and cease practices which restrict visiting journalists from seeking information from citizens and which in effect intimidate citizens into silence.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

U.S. Delegation to the CSCE Information Forum

Statement of Leonard Sussman
Private Sector Advisor

Subworking Group A
26 April 1989

Mr. Chairman, I am Leonard Sussman, specialist in international communications of Freedom House. This is a nongovermental organization in its 48th year, supporting the development of free institutions, particularly the free flow of information, world-wide. I have been a newspaper and broadcast journalist.

I raise today the role of independent journalism as essential for compliance with the Vienna Concluding Document and Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The document and the declaration speak of facilitating "the freer and wider dissemination of information of all kinds" and ensuring that "individuals can freely choose their sources of information."

The emphasis on the individual citizen surely is not accidental. For the right of the individual to choose information is inescapably linked to the right of the journalist to publish or broadcast. And to ensure that information "of all kinds" -- the document's own words -- are accessible to citizens there must inevitably be unofficial as well as official news and information produced and distributed.

From Lidove Noviny in Czechoslovakia to Grenzfall in the GDR to Beszelo in Hungary, independent publishing has expanded the scope and depth of reporting in Eastern Europe. I would venture to say that in Poland and Hungary, as well as in the Soviet Union to some extent, independent publishing has provided the official media with a challenge to report news and information more fully, more quickly and above all, more accurately. I was very glad to hear yesterday in this forum that the Hungarian Association of Journalists has announced its support for equal rights for official and unofficial newspapers. Unfortunately, authorities in Czechoslovakia and the GDR have answered the challenge all too often with fines, interrogations, confiscations and imprisonment.

Since glasnost is presently most dramatically demonstrated in the Soviet Union, I turn to that country to urge the introduction there of independent, unofficial journalism. It is timely to raise this issue because we were told yesterday in a press conference by the Soviet editors that an historic press law is under consideration at the highest levels in the Soviet Union. One version of that draft law, I have heard, would completely

outlaw independent journalism in the Soviet Union. Another version, we heard yesterday, would liberalize Soviet journalism.

Given the momentum of glasnost, we are encouraged to believe that independent journalism will finally be permitted. But recent incidents are troubling. There is, for example, no independent journalist on the Soviet delegation to this conference, though several Eastern European delegations have independent journalists. Yet there are several hundred unofficial publications now appearing in the Soviet Union. They operate with great difficulty. They cannot receive regular supplies of paper or other printing materials. They face harassment and interference in the distribution of their products. Surely, these alternative journalists and other writers deserve formal recognition and assistance rather than rejection.

One of several leading independent journalists, Sergei Grigoryants, publisher of Glasnost magazine, patiently waited for weeks to secure official approval for his publication. When such formal permission was not received, he published Glasnost magazine independently, and, despite harrassment, has been doing so with amazing regularity. He was denied approval because, he was told, there are enough official publications in every field. But that response ignores the central point of the Vienna Document and the Universal Declaration. They urge governments to permit views "of all kinds." Clearly that description includes independent, unofficial journalism. Moreover, three independent journalists, Mr. Grigoryants, Lev Timofeyev and Valery Sendeyov, were recently attacked in a defamatory article in an official Soviet publication.

Far more troubling, Mr. Grigoryants has been imprisoned three times in the past year for pursuing just such independent journalism. His files and his printing equipment have been confiscated. On March 12, 1989, he was arrested for 10 days and fined 150 rubles for covering a demonstration in Moscow as a journalist. To be sure, Mr. Grigoryants did not have a permit required under a recently approved regulation. But that new law itself is retrogressive. There is hardly ever time to secure an official permit before a news event takes place.

Sergei Grigoryants has become a symbol of the Helsinki Process applied to the right of the Soviet people to secure access to news and information "of all kinds." This independent, unofficial journalist was recently selected to receive the annual award of the International Federation of Newspaper Publishers (FIEJ). That meeting will be held this year in the United States. Mr. Grigoryants has applied for a visa to attend. Many of Mr. Grigoryants' journalist colleagues in France, home of FIEJ, and the United States, as well as journalists from all over the world who will attend that conference, will wait with interest not only Mr. Grigoryants' request for a visa, but

whether the Soviet Union in its forthcoming press law finally approves independent, unofficial journalism. Access to independent journalism is a right of the citizens in all countries committed to the CSCE.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

U.S. Delegation to the CSCE Information Forum

Statement of Mr. Nicholas Veliotes
President, Association of American Publishers

Subsidiary Working Body A
May 1, 1989

Mr. Chairman, I am Nicholas Veliotes, President of the Association of American Publishers, the major association of book publishers in the United States. Our members include most of the larger publishers, major university presses and publishers of all sizes and specialities located throughout the country.

My association is a private body, representing privately- owned publishers and a number of so-called non-profit publishers. All have in common no, repeat no, connection with government. I emphasize this essential fact because I have heard comments around this table clearly indicating confusion in the minds of some delegates about the difference between media that are independent and those that are dependencies of a government.

There is no doubt in my mind about this difference since in a previous career I worked 30 years for the U.S. Government. But let me offer a simple test: if media oppose openly all efforts of censorship by governments -- everywhere -- that media is independent.

Books have been called Ambassadors of Goodwill. And certainly they can, and often do, play a crucial role in fostering international understanding and cross cultural communication. Books are a unique and durable form of transmission of ideas and ideals across national boundaries. This, of course, is recognized in the Helsinki Final Act, which calls upon participants to facilitate the dissemination of books and other printed material on their territory from other participating States.

In the United States foreign printed material can be found routinely at newsstands, book stores, libraries, universities, and even the local pharmacy. The same is true for audio-visual material. Anyone has access to this material, if she or he wants it. We import large quantities of foreign printed material -- 600 million books from abroad in 1987, alone.

The U.S. Government plays no role in the selection, importation, distribution or sale of any book. These decisions are made by the demands of the marketplace. Americans read what they wish to read..and our system and people do not tolerate any government body -- domestic or foreign -- including international terrorist threats -- to determine these choices.

Regrettably, this is not the case in some other CSCE countries. For example, in Bulgaria the general public cannot purchase or subscribe to Western publications; foreign printed material is strictly limited in Czechoslovakia; Western newspapers are not available to the average citizen of the German Democratic Republic; few foreign news materials are imported into the Soviet Union; and in Romania foreign material is not available to the general public.

We seek a greater increase in the importation and distribution of foreign printed and audio-video materials in these countries in accordance with the Helsinki Final Act. We seek an end to restrictions on all forms of information and ideas.

Over the past year, we are pleased to note that there have been some encouraging signs in this area. Talks between the Soviet Union and the United States, resulted in some modest but promising developments.

An American book store is now operating in Moscow and there has been an easing of restraint on importation of some periodicals and newspapers. We saw evidence of new thinking at the 1987 Moscow International Book Fair. We look forward to a 100% glasnost atmosphere at this September's Moscow Fair.

This is a beginning. We hope to see greater progress along these lines both in the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries. Periodical and newspaper subscriptions should become commonplace -- book orders an ordinary process for anyone. Religious materials should be imported without interference and audio-visual materials should enter these countries routinely.

Governments must reduce restrictions on the importation and distribution of foreign materials.

And to accommodate this flow of information across and within borders, every country must provide a reliable and uncompromised postal service and accessible public outlets where this material can be found without difficulty for the average citizen.

When we discuss possibilities for increased distribution of foreign materials to East Europe, we often hear the complaint that the need to purchase these products in hard currency places them out of the reach of most citizens. We must cooperate to overcome the problem of currency inconvertibility.

We are pleased to note, therefore, that Yugoslavia has made foreign books, periodicals and newspapers available for purchase in local currency in their book stores.

Moreover, Western organizations interested in entering into commercial relationships with East European enterprises might be willing to consider full or partial payment in local currency, provided ways could be worked out to help them make the best use of this inconvertible currency. New thinking should be applied to the conduct of business as well as politics.

At the top of the list, for such organizations, would be the opportunity to pay their in-country costs with the sales proceeds they receive in local currency. I am, therefore, proposing that electronic and print media individuals and organizations prepared to accept inconvertible currency in payment for goods and services will be able to use these sales proceeds to pay for their in-country business costs.

This serves two purposes -- it provides a useful way for Western business organizations to redirect soft currency sales proceeds toward in-country expenses, and it reduces the demand on host country hard currency reserves.

This, of course, does not rule out existing mechanisms such as offsets and barters. By offering greater flexibility, however, it can attract a much wider array of potential Western business partners for East Europe.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman

U.S. Delegation to the CSCE Information Forum

Statement Delivered by Judith Ingram
Subworking Group A

2 May 1989

Mr. Chairman,

My name is Judith Ingram. I am a staff member of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe and a member of the United States delegation.

Our work here has been enriched by the contributions of private-sector and independent delegates who seek to apply the language of the Helsinki Final Act and Vienna Concluding Document to their real, day-to-day work. They represent a wide variety of interests, from the print media to book publishers to academics fresh from the archives. They have brought their and their colleague's concerns squarely before us, and have forced us to think very hard about how to make the fine ideals of Helsinki and Vienna work not only in the rarified atmosphere of diplomatic talks, but also in the rough-and-tumble world of business and the media. They are the best spokespeople for these topics.

I only regret that we have not been able to hear from other citizens equally dependent on and committed to the free flow of information. These individuals are not easy to fit into a functional category like "journalist" or "professor." They sit not behind the microphone, but in front of the radio. They don't deliver hundreds of foreign journals, but consider themselves lucky if they've gotten hold of a single one. They are united by an insistence on exercising their right to free expression or, as one delegate has pointed out, their right to silence. They are the people the Helsinki process is all about.

They are people like Gheorghe Apostol, Alexandru Birladeanu, Corneliu Manescu, Constantin Pirvulescu, Ion Raceanu and Silviu Brucan, who wrote a letter early this year appealing for more humane Romanian policies. That letter has brought these former Party leaders detentions, house arrest, interrogations, and isolation. They are people like poet Petar Manolov, secretary of the Independent Society for the Protection of Human Rights in Bulgaria, who has faced, along with his family, continual harassment since police broke up a meeting at his home and confiscated his personal papers.

They are people like Augustin Navratil, the author of a 31-point petition on religious freedom signed by over half a million Czech and Slovak Catholics, who was remanded to in-patient

psychiatric care last fall. He has since been released from in-patient care. They are people like Soviet citizen Vladimir Ryabakon, a Russian Orthodox Christian, who had religious literature confiscated upon his return to the Soviet Union last December, in spite of his protests that an article in Izvestiya the previous month had announced that all limitations on the import of religious material had been lifted. Other religious believers in CSCE states likewise depend on their governments to make good in word and deed on the promises made at Helsinki and Vienna -- whether they demand an end to the state censorship of church publications which has taken place increasingly in the German Democratic Republic, or the importation of Bibles or the Koran into a number of CSCE states, where they are published in insufficient numbers.

We must keep in mind likewise the needs of minority members. Since 1984, no Turkish-language publication has appeared to serve the needs of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria. In Romania, Hungarian- and German-language publishing houses have been systematically closed down or merged with Romanian-language ones. Today, only one publishing house, Kriterion, serves the needs of minorities, and it, too, has been merged with a Romanian-language publisher. Members of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria and the Hungarian, German, and other minorities in Romania are prohibited from importing from abroad publications in their languages.

Recently, we have heard that the Moscow International Book Fair, scheduled for September 12 through 18, is to be open to the public for only two days. My delegation is concerned that this period will not be long enough to accomodate the many Soviet citizens who depend on this biennial event to acquaint themselves with world literature. We would ask that public access to the Fair be extended in keeping with our mutual commitment in Vienna to "make further efforts to facilitate the freer and wider dissemination of information of all kinds."

Some delegates in this working group have already made mention of continuing interference with postal service in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. This includes delayed delivery of letters and packages, as well as confiscation, due to censorship. As with many other issues we've addressed here, the postal situation varies widely among East European states, but there is room for improvement in all of them.

Finally, to my knowledge, this working group has not yet addressed the important issue of free access to foreign reading rooms and cultural centers. Impediments range from the absence of such centers to surveillance of those who use the facilities to explicit instructions to some professionals not to visit foreign reading rooms.

Mr. Chairman, the cases I have raised today are emblematic of problems plaguing a significant, if shrinking, number of citizens of CSCE states. In contrast, our discussions here have underlined

the very positive changes underway in Eastern Europe, particularly in Poland and Hungary but also, to some extent, in the Soviet Union. In these countries citizens and the state are finding a common vocabulary of dignity, mutual respect and tolerance. We hope that this vocabulary, as well as a consistent application of Helsinki principles, will steadily reach more citizens of CSCE states.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

U.S. Delegation
to the
CSCE Information Forum

Statement by Gerald L. Warren
Editor, The San Diego Union
Subworking Group A

May 3, 1989

Mr. Chairman,

My name is Gerald L. Warren. I am editor of the San Diego (California) Union and have been designated to represent the American Society of Newspaper Editors at this conference. I also speak as a journalist with 30 years' experience and as one who has served in government as a member of the White House staff. As such, I can testify to the inherent and necessary friction between governments and journalists. My governmental service has made me more convinced that CSCE governments should place no restrictions on journalists that do not apply to every other citizen but should facilitate the journalists' access to official and unofficial sources and documents in order to insure a free flow of information across borders.

As an independent editor, and a private sector adviser to the U.S. Delegation, I wish to commend the delegations for the spirit of openness in these discussions and the provisions of access to this conference. I also appreciate the major role taken by the professional journalists who are attending.

I wish to address the proposal for increased exchanges of journalists between the United States and the Soviet Union and the proposal for exchange of articles between newspapers in each country.

The American Society of Newspaper Editors for some years has organized delegations of editors which have visited the Soviet Union, the Middle East, China, among other areas. A delegation of 14 members of the Society leaves for the USSR on the 26th of this month. Similar delegations visited the USSR in 1984, 1986 and 1987. Such visits will continue, I am sure. The Society encourages member editors and newspapers to participate in exchanges of editors and journalists in residence with colleagues in other countries but is not committed to arranging specific agreements. Each of the 1,000 members of the Society in the United States and Canada is independent and serves diverse readerships. Individual arrangements, of course, are also welcome.

The American Newspaper Publishers Association, I am told, is exploring ways in which its members could offer new opportunities for Soviet newspaper people to come to the United States to see

firsthand how U.S. newspapers operate. Similarly, U.S. newspaper people, under such a program, could be given the opportunity to spend time at newspapers in the Soviet Union. While the program remains in its initial planning stages, the ANPA is anxious to proceed with that planning process and the hoped-for implementation of a valuable program.

The idea of exchanging articles between newspapers has merit but as an editor I must say that most newspapers in the United States would not promise to publish any article submitted from any source be it private, governmental or journalistic. We jealously guard our responsibility as editors and publishers to decide what will be published our newspapers.

Mr. Chairman, I have signed two proposals drafted by a group of individual journalists relating to visas and working conditions for journalists. I believe they frame an excellent foundation for future cooperation between journalists of CSCE countries. I also have signed a proposal submitted by individual private sector members of the U.S. Delegation relating to rights of foreign journalists. I endorse the specific recommendations contained in that document and urge all CSCE members to implement them.

I should stress the importance to our journalists working abroad and to all foreign journalists of the right to receive without restriction regional newspapers and magazines.

Another vital point made at this conference is the need for unimpeded access to archives in CSCE countries -- an example was given by the delegate of the United Kingdom of the difficulty in accessing newspapers from archives near Moscow. Journalists are historians of the present, Mr. Chairman, or if not, they should be. Easier access to archives and official documents is essential to the free flow of information.

As discussed by my colleague, Murray Fromson, last week one of the most significant events in the search for truth in the United States was the enactment of the Freedom of Information Act in 1966. This act established an effective statutory right of access to federal government information. Generally, it provides that any person has a right, enforceable in court, to access to federal agency records, except for these records (or portions of the records) that are protected from disclosure by exemptions of the FOIA. A denial of access can be appealed in the courts.

In conclusion, let me refer to the idea for an ethical consensus among journalists of CSCE member nations. If journalists from member nations visit the United States they will hear discussions of ethical considerations in every professional gathering and every informal meeting of journalists. These ethical standards cannot be imposed by governments; journalists must impose ethical standards on governments.

Mr. Chairman, if more CSCE journalists visit the United States

they will find that freedom of expression is an absolute right even if the exercise of that right proves troubling and embarrassing to our government.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

U.S. Delegation
to the
CSCE Information Forum

The Need to Free Copier Machines and Desktop Printers
Submitted by Leonard Sussman
Senior Scholar in International Communications
Freedom House, New York
Subsidiary Working Body A
May 5, 1989

Earlier, here, I stressed the commitment of the CSCE countries to allow individuals as well as organizations to "distribute information of all kinds." I have previously stressed the phrase "of all kinds." That commits CSCE countries to permit independent journalists and other information processors to function openly.

I emphasize today the commitment in the same paragraph (VCD number 34) to allow independent individuals to reproduce information material of all kinds.

The act of copying, either by printing or by photocopy, is essential to the further commitment to exchange and permit an unimpeded flow of information.

Yet, there are countries represented here which prevent the use of copier machines, computer printers and other copy facilities, except for official purposes. And some states represented here license the typewriter to prevent even the minimal exchange of information uncontrolled by central authority.

I was visited at this conference by Reverend Dick Rodgers, a Londoner who flew to Moscow on April 14 taking with him a printing machine which was impounded by customs at the airport, and still today remains impounded. The duplicator was intended for Alexander Ogorodnikov, editor of the Bulletin of the Christian Community. This is an ecumenical magazine that reports religious activities in the Soviet Union. I show you this copy. Not only was the duplicator impounded but, as with other unofficial publications, paper, printing plates and other duplicating equipment is denied these publishers. There are other cases of computers used for publishing being confiscated.

I believe there is no specific section of the Soviet Criminal Code which restricts the purchase of copier machines or computer printers. But recently Article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code was amended to make it a crime to use such machines for "subverting or weakening Soviet power...[for] slanderous fabrications" and other vague charges.

I accept the word of our Soviet colleagues that the application of such restrictions these days may be the fault of low level bureaucrats who have not yet accommodated to the spirit of glasnost and, indeed, the spirit of the Helsinki Final Act and the Vienna Concluding Document.

Yet, I have the word of Moscow News -- a newspaper I admire and read regularly -- that it is necessary to secure a license to purchase a copying machine. To license is to hold the power to remove that license; again, a hinderance to the free flow of information.

I do not mean to imply that any one country alone requires licensing of copiers or desktop printers. I mention the Soviet Union because it is making notable strides in permitting diverse views; and, one hopes, soon these hindrances to free expression will be eliminated.

I am, therefore, formally submitting this proposal for the consideration of this conference and for relaying to Helsinki in 1992:

With the increasing demand for copying written and photographic material in small numbers as well as for desktop publishing, it is essential to insure the right of individuals and organizations to purchase such equipment and use it without official licensing or controls. I, therefore, propose that CSCE countries:

1. Remove administrative and criminal restrictions and penalties leveled against independently obtaining, possessing, reproducing, publishing and distributing printed and photographic materials.

2. Permit private ownership, use of and access to typewriters, word processors, copying machines and related instruments.

3. Respect intellectual property rights in the use of such reproducing facilities.

* * *

As serious proponents of the Helsinki Process we can do no less.

SUBWORKING GROUP B STATEMENTS

U.S. Delegation
to the
CSCE Information Forum

Statement of Rudolf V. Perina
Deputy Chairman of Delegation
U.S. Delegation to the London Information Forum

Subworking Group B
24 April 1989

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a few minutes this morning to comment on how the United States delegation approaches the work of this, and indeed of the other, working groups in this Forum, whether in formal or informal session. As our delegation Chairman stated last week, our delegation consists of both private sector and governmental representatives. Both of these categories of representatives may be addressing this body over the course of the next two weeks. The private sector representatives will speak on their own behalf, and I wish I could tell you what issues they may raise, but I honestly do not know. I am sure they will be issues of importance to them, however, and of importance to the subject matter of the Forum.

Our governmental representatives will speak on issues also related to this Forum which are of concern to our government and to broad sections of the American public. I would like to stress, Mr. Chairman, that our approach will not be confrontational. We have come here, like other delegations, to make progress, and we know that progress cannot be made without the cooperation of all concerned. But progress also cannot be made if we avoid difficult issues and difficult questions. We know there is a school of thought which argues that - on the contrary - we should focus on areas where we all agree and put the tough problems aside for a later day. This is a very tempting approach but in the long term a dangerous one. It creates illusions which, particularly in this information age, will not fool our publics for long.

That is why the foundation of our discussion, Mr. Chairman, should be a detailed and rigorous implementation review. Our only reliable guide to what is needed in the future is the reality of the past and the present. We want to look at this present reality - at both its encouraging aspects and its worrisome ones. This will involve discussing the implementation of many countries, including the United States. We are ready for such a discussion. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, the American delegation will seek to answer constructively any questions about our own implementation which are raised in a constructive manner and which fall within the competency of this forum.

We hope this same constructive approach will be taken in response to questions of concern to our delegation. For example:

-- We heard many statements during our opening week about the welcome cessation of jamming. But we have reliable reason to believe that radio and television broadcasts eminating from Turkey continue to be jammed in Bulgaria. We do not see how this can be reconciled with CSCE commitments.

-- We received a report over the weekend that just last Friday, April 21st, Czechoslovak authorities prevented four members of the Czechoslovak Helsinki Committee, including former Czechoslovak Foreign Minister hajek, from traveling to Warsaw to attend a general meeting of the International Helsinki Federation. This is not in keeping with commitments to promote the flow of oral information.

-- We know that since 1985 there have been no television or radio broadcasts in Hungarian, German or any other minority language permitted in Romania. This would appear to be one of the many failures of the Romanian Government to abide by CSCE information provisions.

-- Because we are all heartened by the new vibrancy and vigor of Soviet television, we regret developments which seem to go counter to the general trend. We understand that in February of this year a television program sponsored by the Lithuanian Popular front was taken off the air, and last month the producer and hosts of the Latvian nightly news program "Panorama" were censured by Latvian authorities. We hope these are temporary setbacks to the policy of Glasnost which we all support.

Mr. Chairman, these few examples are indicative of the types of problems which we believe must be addressed at this Forum. But in addition to such problems, we hope as well to discuss the encouraging and positive developments which are occuring in Poland, Hungary, the Soviet Union and on occasion in other countries as well. And we also wish to discuss cooperative aspects of international communication and what the United States can do to promote these. Indeed, this afternoon, in another working body, a member of the United States delegation will address precisely this issue, using an example of U.S.-Soviet cooperation as a model. Mr. Chairman, we have much work to do in this group and the United States stands ready to work with all other delegations to get it done.

U.S. Delegation
to the
CSCE Information Forum

Statement Delivered by Daniel B. Smith
Subworking Group B
April 26, 1989

Thank you, Mr. Chairman:

As the distinguished delegate from the UK has noted, Mr. Chairman, access to information has traditionally been a problem in many CSCE countries. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the area of gaining access to private sources of information. All too often, private citizens have been threatened, harassed, or even prosecuted for meeting with foreign journalists. The problem is to some extent compounded in a visual medium such as television, where the object is not simply to obtain information from various sources but to find individuals willing to appear on camera.

Until recently, few private citizens were willing in most Eastern European countries to speak openly before television or film cameras -- a fact which significantly inhibited broadcast journalism by western reporters in those states. We therefore welcome the changes in the Soviet Union, Poland and Hungary which have, to some extent, removed this impediment by eliminating the threat of retribution. The results have been in some instances dramatic and have contributed to a much better western appreciation of the political, economic, and social developments in these countries. Ultimately, such frank and open reporting serves to enhance mutual understanding and underscore our shared problems and concerns.

But I do not wish to give the impression, Mr. Chairman, that all the obstacles have been removed. Despite welcome changes in the Soviet Union, Mr. Chairman, we still find instances where contact between western journalists and Soviet citizens is discouraged or where, as has been pointed out earlier, entire regions are closed to western reporters due to "reasons of a temporary nature."

I was pleased, Mr. Chairman, to watch on British television on Monday a program on Czechoslovakia which included interviews with some prominent dissidents and other private citizens who spoke frankly about the situation in their country. I take this as a welcome sign of increased openness in Czechoslovakia. But at the same time, Mr. Chairman, I support the intervention by the distinguished delegate from Sweden in calling attention to the case of Czechoslovak playwright Vaclav Havel, who sits today in a Czechoslovak prison in part for his willingness to give interviews to western radio on the eve of the demonstrations in January in honor of Jan Palach.

Unfortunately, other nations in Eastern Europe also continue to discourage their citizens from having contact with foreign journalists. Often such measures take the form of specific legislation against "harming the interests of the state abroad." In Romania, for example, a 1971 law forbids citizens from giving interviews to foreign press representatives which "defame socialist reality." In addition, a never published 1985 decree prohibits any Romanian citizen from having unauthorized contact with foreigners.

I could cite other examples, Mr. Chairman, but I would simply note that we regard such efforts to inhibit contacts with foreign journalists or punish those who criticize their governments in foreign broadcasts as a sign not of strength but of weakness. In the final analysis, Mr. Chairman, such efforts are not only contrary to the spirit of the Helsinki process, they are self-defeating. We hope that such barriers to the free flow of information can be eliminated and that journalists from all countries will be free to interview private citizens in all walks of life without fear that such interviews will lead to persecution or even imprisonment for their subjects.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

U.S. Delegation
to the
CSCE Information Forum

Statement by E. Eugene Pell
President of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty
SWB B, April 26, 1989

I welcome this opportunity to appear before the conference and present a brief, factual account of the work of our organization and the important role it plays in the free flow of information.

I regret that other commitments prevented my being present earlier this week, when -- as I understand -- certain references to Radio Free Europe were made by the distinguished delegate from Czechoslovakia.

Radio Free Europe was created by the United States Congress in 1949. Radio Liberty was founded two years later. The mission of each was -- and is -- to provide a source of uncensored news, information, and ideas to audiences whose governments systematically deny fundamental freedoms of communication and contact. Sadly, almosts four decades after the founding of these radios, such denial continues -- in varying degree -- in all of the countries to which we broadcast.

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are dedicated to the proposition embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states: everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression: this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference, and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

It is precisely in that context and in that spirit that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are engaged in the practice of independent, professional, and responsible broadcast journalism.

In contrast to the Voice of America, whose primary mission is to present United States policy and to project U.S. society and institutions, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty seek to identify with the interests of its listeners, devoting particular attention to matters directly affecting the peoples of Eastern Europe and the USSR. In focusing on the special concerns of its audiences, it functions as a home service and conducts itself as a surrogate, free press.

RFE/RL is not, as stated here earlier this week, a part of the United States Information Service. The Board for International Broadcasting -- an independent United States Government agency whose members are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, is the body charged with overseeing the work of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Those of us at RFE/RL are heartened and encouraged by recent movements, however incomplete, toward greater media openness in some of the CSCE member states. We were, after all, exponents of Glasnost and Perestroika long before the terms became fashionable. We have, for years, sought to provide an accurate depiction of history and culture in the countries to which we broadcast -- long before similar depictions began to appear in recent months in domestic media. It is indeed gratifying to see the media in some CSCE member states now reporting news and information we have been reporting for years -- for which we were the recipients only of official vilification and the jamming of our broadcasts.

This trend is perhaps best illustrated by the cover of a recent edition of a leading, monthly satirical magazine in one country to which we broadcast. The cover is devoted entirely to a cartoon of a man and wife at home. The woman is shown in the foreground preparing a meal. Her husband appears in the doorway holding a newspaper and saying -- isn't it interesting and wonderful that our newspapers are now printing all the alleged lies we have been hearing for years on Radio Free Europe?

We receive a vast amount of mail and telephone calls from listeners. I regret to say however, that there is still interference in some CSCE states with such contact and recrimination against those who seek to make it. But judging by what we do hear from listeners in many countries, including Czechoslovakia, the peoples we serve rely on our broadcasts and deeply appreciate them, even if their government officials do not.

I assume, however, that many of those officials themselves must be among our listeners -- how else to criticize the content. I am reminded of the experience my counterpart at the BBC had a few months ago when he received a visitor from a state represented at this conference who complained about alleged disinformation on BBC broadcasts. When asked how he could be so familiar with the program as to make such a comment he replied: "very simple. I tune in every morning to disinform myself for thirty minutes."

Now, finally, everyone can tune in, and we are gratified that the illegal practice of jamming our broadcasts and others has at last been halted. We believe this is a positive step toward achieving a free flow of information.

However, with regard to the proposition put forward this week by the distinguished representative of Czechoslovakia -- namely that his government would consider destroying its jamming devices once Radio Free Europe went off the air -- let me point out that the Helsinki Final Act and the Vienna Concluding Document bind all signatory states to ease interfering with international radio broadcasts without condition and without exception.

If, as the distinguished representative of Czechoslovakia suggested on Monday, the Czechoslovak Government wishes Radio Free Europe to cease broadcasting, there is one sure way to bring about such a result -- full and complete compliance with the letter and spirit of the Helsinki Final Act and related documents and, for that matter, with the wishes of the Czechoslovak people.

As to the notion put forward by the distinguished representative from Czechoslovakia that Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty exist to undermine socialism, and seek to incite unrest against his government, I will spare this assembly a detailed rebuttal of this unfounded claim.

Allow me instead to quote the words of a prominent citizen of Czechoslovakia as they appeared in the dissident, monthly publication, Lidove Noviny. Quote: "Socialism is not threatened by Radio Free Europe, but by erroneous policies that ignore the needs and opinions of the public". End quote. Those words were spoken by former Czechoslovak Communist Party leader Alexander Dubcek.

U.S. Delegation
to the
CSCE Information Forum

Statement of Mr. Murray Fromson
Professor, Center for Internatinal Journalism
University of Southern California

Subsidiary Working Body B
April 28, 1989

Mr. Chairman, my name is Murray Fromson. I am a private sector member of the U.S. delegation, a Professor of Journalism at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles, where four years ago, I conceived and began the Center for International Journalism. Each year, we bring together for one full year approximately a dozen journalists from the United States and Latin America to study and report what they see and learn about both the northern and southern parts of the hemisphere. Most of our attention is on the U.S. and Mexico. But there are certain lessons that can be learned in both places that have certain universal application. Funding for this program -- about 600 thousand dollars annually -- comes entirely from the private sector. There is not one penny of U.S. Government money involved. The support comes from a variety of foundations and corporations, as well as the university which is private -- and there is no attempt to link that support to any particular ideological point of view despite the fact that many of the supporters do look at the world through different colored spectacles. Our objective is to have journalists, free of deadlines and the pressures to publish or broadcast immediately, to reflect...to break down stereotypes...to expose journalists of major news organizations to sharply contrasting political and economic systems, different cultures, popular attitudes and concepts of a free press and free expressions that exist within the hemisphere.

It is my hope that one day soon our program can encompass or include journalists from other parts of the globe, including Europe. The themes, experiences, and yes, disagreements and debates that are heard each year as we spend eight months in Los Angeles and three months in Mexico City would be familiar to you. These issues are often seen differently in the north and south. I would entourage inquiries at this conference about the possibility of having a journalist from the Socialist Bloc, with an interest in Latin America, that might result in the participation in our program at the University of Southern California each year.

Speaking as one who has come late to academia, I should explain that I have been a working journalist for some 35 years. My experience bridges both the Korean and Vietnam wars at great length and also having served for three years as the Moscow correspondent for CBS News.

I cannot say with enough emphasis how pleased I have been the past two days to hear ideas expressed here that I would not have imagined possible when I was reporting the runup to the Helsinki Accords in 1973 and 1974. What this conference seems to be moving toward, albeit deliberately and perhaps too slowly for an impatient journalist, are agreements that would ensure a continent free of restraint on the printed and spoken word. That would apply, of course, to those who transmit the messages -- namely the journalists.

The past 14 months of the Gorbachev era have been absolutely breathtaking, compared to the past 14 years when the CSCE began these deliberations.

But, this does not mean, by any stretch of the imagination, that there is a common notion of what is truly involved in supporting a totally open free press and an atmosphere of free expression.

To my knowledge, no where else in the world is there anything resembling the Freedom of Information Act, which has been enforced for the past 15 years in the United States. Under term of the so-called FOI Act, all Americans, including journalists, can obtain on demand any government document they may want. I daresay, some journalists have been given their own personal files accumulated by the FBI. -- that doubles them over with laughter. They are that preposterous.

There have been suggestions from representatives of the Soviet and German Democratic delegations that criticism by some delegates from the West ought to be accompanied by more self criticism. I hope they were in the hall this morning to hear the delegate from the United Kingdom chastise the Thatcher government's treatment of the British press.

Let me also point out that it requires only the sketchiest reading of U.S. magazines like the Columbia Journalism Review and the Washington Journalism Review, or to read the media criticism in both the mainstream and alternative press to realize how frequently journalistic practices come under a microscope. As a co-founder of the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press, I am proud to say that we in American journalism have been fighting all attempts by government at the local, state and federal levels to restrict reporters and their access to news for more than 20 years. It would therefore be inconsistent for any journalist who subscribes to <u>that</u> principle to be a member of a delegation to this conference and be any less insistent that government should have no role in restricting press freedom wherever it may occur.

We in the U.S. have had a historic obsession with getting government off of our backs. In the spirit of universality, let me suggest to the distinguished spokesman for the Soviet delegation that Glasnost may not even be a Soviet idea. We Americans have been fighting for more openness almost from the time the republic was founded.

As many of you have already pointed out, much has been accomplished here and much needs to be done.

The Soviet delegation has asked that governments might assist the Tass News Agency to gain wider distribution of its service in other countries. Might I respectfully suggest that the success or failure of Tass should not depend on the intervention of any government. Instead, it should be judged in the marketplace of ideas. When the belief emerges that Tass is an independent wire service like the Associated Press, Reuters, Agence France Press or Deutsche Presse Agentur, then it, too, will probably attract more circulation in the West, certainly far more credibility than it does today.

Whether the issue is the selling of a particular news service or exposing consumers of news, governments should have no role in playing either the agent or arbiter. Never underestimate the intelligence of ordinary people -- or their common sense -- in deciding what is believable and what is not.

Astonishing are the changes taking place in the Soviet Union with regard to access and working conditions for the foreign press that I must confess to some jealousy. I wish, at times, that I were back in Moscow. Unfortunately, my experiences were of a different and negative nature. A report I did on auto racing in the USSR comes to mind. Soviet authorities did not like it. So one story was shipped "expeditiously" by air to the United States by way of Outer Mongolia instead of Paris. And there was the time during the last Nixon-Brezhnev Summit, when Soviet technicians suspended satellite transmissions of stories I reported on Andrei Sakhorov and Soviet Jews. I am happy to report, after a conversation last night with a former television colleague now based in Rome, that such treatment today is abnormal.

Nevertheless, I support the principles laid down by the Moscow Correspondents Association, which are aimed at improving working conditions even further. I hope that many of the concerns in the Association's statement will be addressed by Soviet authorities in the near future.

In the long run, however, matters of accessibility of housing, and the freedom to hire employees of choice, and the speed with which visas are issued are minor issues compared to the broader questions concerned with a freer press, freer expression and a wider flow of information.

But only when the technicalities are improved can we reach the necessary agreements that will focus on the content of news; and, only then will the true significance of this conference be realized.

I, for one, am encouraged by the televised pictures we have seen recently from Hungary, from Poland, China and, of course, the Soviet Union. They are frequently unpleasant images for government officials in those countries to watch. But only by tolerating, and indeed encouraging such diverse reporting, can we seriously come to mutual understanding of what a free press means around the globe.

The evidence thus far is truly encouraging. We have come a long way, but still have a long way to go in pursuit of a free press everywhere. That is the singular responsibility of the Forum.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman

U.S. Delegation
to the
CSCE Information Forum

Statement Delivered by Ronald McNamara
Subworking Group B

3 May 1989

Mr. Chairman,

This afternoon I will focus my remarks on the right of individuals and groups of individuals to receive and disseminate information and ideas. The examples cited here are illustrative of the problems faced by the those in the Soviet Union and parts of Eastern Europe who seek freely to exercise their rights. I raise these concerns in the hope that they will lead to improved implementation of the commitments undertaken by all CSCE participating states.

There have been some positive signs that the self-imposed shroud of secrecy, which has surrounded the Soviet Union for decades, has begun to be lifted. Against this backdrop, it was particularly disconcerting to learn of strict new regulations governing the dissemination of information on nuclear accidents, such as the disaster which occured at Chernobyl. Ironically, the decree, signed by the Soviet Minister of Energy and Electrification, was issued on the third anniversary of Chernobyl. If implemented the decree would sharply curtail information. This action serves as a direct threat to the public health and safety of those living inside the Soviet Union, as well as those outside of Soviet territory subject to fallout from such disasters. In addition the move would deal a serious blow to the increased freedom experienced by Soviet journalists in recent years. A commentary which appeared in Moscow News following the announcement observed that "the adherents of secrecy are not about to surrender their positions." We hope the powers of glasnost will prevail.

Despite the three weeks which have passed since Soviet troops broke up a demonstration in the Georgian capital of Tbilisi, authorities refuse to release information about the toxic substances which have claimed at least two lives and sent scores of others to the hospital. Efforts to treat the victims have been hampered by the lack of this vital information.

In the aftermath of this incident, several individuals, including Dr. Andrei Sakharov, have called for an independent investigation into the incident. While it may be too late to help those exposed to the substance, it is not too late to uncover the truth surrounding this tragedy.

Some individuals are denied their right to freedom of

expression when their requests to travel abroad for purposes of attending seminars, conferences, or other types of meetings are denied by authorities. One recent case in the U.S.S.R. involved Dr. Juris Vidins, Chairman of the Latvian Helsinki-86 Group. Vidins had hoped to attend the American Latvian Association Congress scheduled to open May 5 in the United States. He submitted the necessary paperwork and paid the fees. Vidins was told his visa would be ready on April 28. When he arrived at the visa office on the appointed day, Vidins was told that his documents were lost and that he would not be receiving a visa.

In addition, individuals who are allowed to leave may encounter difficulties upon their return to the Soviet Union. Members of a delegation of the Latvian Popular Front had a variety of materials seized when they arrived in Moscow. Among the items confiscated were newspapers, clippings, publications, notes and correspondence, as well as personal computers, telephones, and other gifts received during their month-long time in North America.

Several other developments in the Soviet Union give cause for concern. Last July, for example, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet issued a decree on rallies. In practice, the decree has been used to prevent individuals and groups from presenting their views through peaceful rallies. Several unauthorized rallies have been broken up recently in the Ukrainian city of Lvov, for example. Organizers of these peaceful demonstrations have been fined or placed in jail. We hope that this policy is only a temporary setback for the forces of glasnost.

Turning to Eastern Europe, I reiterate our concern over the Turkish minority which makes up ten percent of the the population in Bulgaria. Ethnic Turks are not free to even use their mother tongue. Indeed, fines have been imposed on those speaking Turkish.

Bulgarian human rights activists have also been subjected to harassment in an attempt to prevent them from expressing their views freely. A meeting of members of the Society for the Protection of Human Rights, the independent trade union- Podkrepa, and the Committee for the Defense of Relgious Freedom, planned for late April had to be cancelled after fifteen members of the groups were arrested. Christopher Subev and Stephan Komitov were arrested and later released. Among those believed to be still under arrest are Angel Sokolofsky and Angel Vassilev. The secretary of the Society, Petus Manolov, has been the subject of continued harassment.

In Romania, it is hard to know where to begin listing that country's interference with the free flow of information. We have called attention elsewhere to specific examples of Romania's failure to live up to its CSCE commitments, but I wanted in this context to draw attention to Romania's continued failure to allow members of national minorities full access to news and information in their mother tongue.

As has been mentioned by others, Wenceslas Square, in downtown Prague, was the scene earlier this week of the latest attempt by the Czechoslovak authorities to squelch dissent. Several dozen Charter 77 signatories and representatives of other independent groups had gathered for a peaceful demonstration. They were surrounded by police after they displayed banners calling for the release of Vaclav Havel and others. Among those detained for chanting unauthorized slogans were Tomas Hradilek and Jan Ruml. The May Day incident is only the most recent example of the Czechoslovak government's refusal to sanction peaceful public dissent. With one exception in the past twenty years, Czechoslovak authorities have refused to give permission to independent groups to organize peaceful protests -- we find in this fact stark testimony to the absence of free speech in Czechoslovakia. The case of Misha Glenny, which we heard about yesterday, is not an isolated one but is part of a pattern of harassment of foreign journalists working in Czechoslovakia.

We also note that several individuals were reportedly detained in East Berlin over the weekend after they staged a peaceful demonstration during parades organized by the Communist party.

These are a few examples of actions inconsistent with the commitments of the participating states to respect the rights of individuals and groups of individuals to freedom of information and expression. In Vienna, all 35 participating states reaffirmed their resolve fully to implement, unilaterally, bilaterally and multilaterally, all provisions of the Final Act and of the other CSCE documents. We hope even greater efforts will be made to abide by this commitment.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

U.S. Delegation
to the
CSCE Information Forum

Statement of Mr. William T. Reed
Senior Vice President, Education Services
Public Broadcasting Service (PBS)
SWB E, May 8, 1989

As Prepared
For Delivery

Mr. Chairman, my name is William T. Reed, Senior Vice President, Education Services, the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS), in Alexandria, Virginia. PBS is the membership organization for public television in the United States. During this conference, I have heard a number of remarks that indicate, perhaps, a lack of understanding about public television in my country, including the suggestion that the only way the free flow of information is guaranteed in the United States is by turning everything over to commercial broadcasting. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a few minutes to tell this distinguished group about public television, and my organization, PBS, the Public Broadcasting Service.

First, an important distinction: public television in the U.S. is non-commercial television -- we are prohibited by law from selling commercials to raise revenues for operations. We are, at the same time, from the private sector -- PBS and public television stations are private, non-profit insitutions.

Today, there are over 340 public television stations. These stations are owned (or licensed to) colleges and universities; state boards of education or state commissions; local school boards of education; and local communications organizations. As you can see from the ownership of these stations, our roots are firmly planted in education -- to use television, and now telecommunications, to provide educational programs and materials to all segments of the American population from pre-school to post-retirement.

In 1953, the first public television station went on the air, KUHT, funded and owned by the University of Houston. Today, public television is funded by a variety of sources: local fund-raising events; colleges and universities; state governments; private and public foundations; business and industry; private gifts; and the U.S. Government. Federal funding accounts for less than 20% of all public television funds.

Because of this diverse funding base, no one funder is in control, providing for the maximum amount of independence in our program funding decisions. While this fact is a major strength, public television in the United States is not adequately funded, and as a result, much of our time and energy is spent searching for the funding to produce and distribute all the programs we would like to create.

On this point, I would like to digress for a moment. U.S. public television has long looked to the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) as the public broadcasting service to emulate. Indeed, over the years, PBS has distributed many BBC programs because they are the best in the world and among the most popular on public television. And I want to add my voice to the concern expressed by the distinguished Norwegian delegate last week for the continuation of the BBC as the model for properly funded and independent public broadcasting service. Should the BBC be anything less than that, all of us working in public service broadcasting would be diminished for it.

In the United States, the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) works on behalf of all public television stations: PBS maintains and operates the satellite interconnection system; obtains and schedules programs and provides stations with information about those programs; helps stations in fund raising efforts; and distributes programming to public television stations on the satellite interconnection system.

Each week over 100 million people watch public television, and over the years, PBS has developed a reputation for quality programming, programming that is produced by our stations and independent producers in the U.S.; and programs acquired from foreign producers and international co-productions.

I believe that the work of public service broadcasting in particular, and telecommunications in general, in the United States and throughout the world will have an increasingly important role to play if we are ever going to achieve the mutual understanding and respect among all people of the world, understanding and respect that must be present if the objectives of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe are to be realized. We in telecommunications can contribute through the transmission of information and education. Public television in the United States has had a long tradition of providing this kind of information and education.

Today, U.S. public television has many of the best television journalists on the air: William F. Buckley, Jr., Jim Lehrer, Robert McNeil, Bill Moyers, Roger Mudd, Judy Woodruff and others. Most of these journalists have moved from commercial television to public

television, where they are free to develop stories in-depth, without the commercial pressure to deliver the largest audience to a commercial advertiser and in the shortest possible time. Other outstanding commercial television journalists like Peter Jennings and Ted Koppel work with public television on a project-by-project basis. As a result, public television has, in my view, the most comprehensive, independent, and hard-hitting coverage of both national and international public affairs on U.S. television. We are now trying to develop ways to better use these resources for educational purposes in schools and colleges.

Public television first became known for its children's and cultural programming. Sesame Street is now seen in over 40 countries around the world. And our children's program, Mister Rogers' Neighborhood, recently worked with Gostelradio in a program exchange.

In adult learning, during the past eight years, over one million people in the U.S. have received college credit from local colleges and universities using television courses distributed by PBS.

Public television is also reaching out to do more in the international community. Last year, PBS, with our member station, WHRO-TV, and Old Dominion University, both in Norfolk, Virginia, worked with Gostelradio to broadcast a live, two-way video spacebridge with high school students from throughout the Soviet Union and the U.S. THe program was a ninety-minute, spontaneous dialogue on topics such as family life, school, music, clothes and stereotyping. There were tough questions from both sides, but there was understanding and friendship, as well. It was a thrilling sight to see. Over 8 million high school students in the U.S. viewed the program, and while I am not so naive to believe that this one event solved any major problems, I do believe we took a first step toward better understanding of each other's culture.

Last April, 1988, in Washington, D.C., and last September in Moscow, under the leadership of the United States Information Agency (USIA), I participated in bi-lateral information talks with the Soviet Union. Those meetings were very productive for the private sector in the U.S. During those talks, PBS presented four proposals for consideration by Gostelradio, proposals that, if carried forward, would continue to use television as a way for the U.S. and the Soviet Union to understand each other better. These proposals include: 1) a series examining foreign policy decisions in the U.S and USSR; 2) a live seminar with U.S. and Soviet athletic coaches; and 3) a series for high school students on space exploration. I look forward to hearing a response to our proposal from Gostelradio soon.

On this note, Mr. Chairman, I would also be interested in having more details on the Soviet Union's proposals to create an information and cultural television program.

Public television working with other national television organizations can help break down the barriers that separate us. I would look forward to hearing from any of the delegations about how we might work together for the future.

Thank you.

SUBWORKING GROUP C STATEMENTS

U.S. Delegation
to the
CSCE Information Forum

SWB C - COMMUNICATION
American Delegation Opening Statement (Given by John Thomson)
Monday, April 24, 1989

The old saying that "One picture is worth a thousand words" indicates the important role that audio-visual materials have in providing information and overcoming mistaken stereotypes. New developments in communication--high definition television, direct satellite broadcasting, and digitalization--promise to make audio visual materials ever more important. We are not, however, restricting our comments to audio-visual materials or telecommunications; we will also discuss cooperation on other issues and practical solutions.

At this first session of the working group on communications, the American delegation considers it essential to state what we believe the role of government should be in international information work. Our experience tells us that it is best for governments to restrict themselves to two activities. These are 1) to facilitate bilateral contacts between organizations in each country, and 2) to help remove non-commercial or bureaucratic restrictions on the sale or exchange of materials. Detailed negotiations should be left to those who hold the rights to the materials, and the distributors. Governments should serve only as a clearinghouse for these contacts between East and West.

We wish to emphasize the words private and bilateral. The American government, in the Voice of America and Worldnet Television Service, produces only a small amount of radio and television programs. In America, with the exception of the Voice of America and Worldnet Television, all rights to audio-visual products--radio programs, films, television programs--are owned by private companies. If foreign state-owned or private companies want to use American programs, then they must obtain appropriate authorization from rights holders to do so. We are pleased that the USSR delegation has acknowledged this fact in their memorandum regarding the creation of an information and cultural television program for Europe and North America.

In his remarks at the Plenary Session, Ambassador Marks emphasized that the American delegation includes private sector participants from film, broadcasting, communications and other fields. We hope members of other delegations attending this Forum will have fruitful discussions with them. Not all our participants are here at this time, but we will circulate a notice to all delegations to let them know when the American private sector representatives will come to London. We will also arrange opportunities for discussions with them. We hope that these contacts here in London will result in specific cooperative projects.

There are profound differences in governmental systems between East and West. We have found that bilateral discussions and agreements are the ones most likely to lead to specific, mutually beneficial programs of cooperation. When different governmental systems attempt to negotiate on cooperative projects involving private ownership of copyrighted audio-visual materials, it is extremely difficult to work out satisfactory arrangements. We therefore think the negotiations to acquire these types of materials should be done bilaterally, rather than multilaterally.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to discuss some specifics, beginning with government facilitation of contacts. I mentioned that there are profound differences between the political and economic systems of the East and West, and in the way audio-visual products are produced and distributed. However, if both sides are firmly committed to finding new ways of cooperation, experience has shown that it is possible to overcome these differences. For example, the US-USSR information talks, which began in 1988, have resulted in several concrete accomplishments. There is now in Moscow an American bookstore, a new Voice of America bureau, and some increase in the sales of American newspapers and periodicals. We have also begun to discuss reciprocal establishment of cultural centers. It is through such concrete steps as these that we gain better exchanges of information.

In Moscow in September 1988, the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) and their Soviet counterpart organization signed an agreement in principle for producers and distributors to work in the other country's audio-visual markets. The language of this agreement is in line with established business practices in Western Europe. Another important agreement the MPAA reached with the USSR was to provide for protection of intellectual property (copyright) of audio-visual products in each other's other country.

For the initial talks with the Soviet Union, the U.S. government organized a comprehensive American private sector delegation, including publishers, broadcasters, film makers, and communications specialists. They met in several discussion groups. We let the private sector do the talking and conclude the deals. For us, there are three reasons why these talks were successful: both sides wanted them to succeed, they were bilateral, and the American private sector representatives--the decision makers in their own companies--did the talking.

To extend the successful experience of the US-USSR information talks to other countries, we recommend that similar talks be organized to encourage greater cooperation between East and West. This means comprehensive, bilateral information talks among media, audio-visual and publishing experts.

The second thing government can do is to eliminate unnecessary government or non-government imposed bureaucratic hinderances to the free flow of information within and between countries. The American government will work actively to reduce or eliminate these hinderances, because our basic philosophy is "The government that governs best is the government that governs least." Let's look at some examples.

Bureaucratic restrictions on the use of communications circuits and equipment are a major problem. One example of this is the requirement for owners of television receive-only satellite dishes to get a license to use them from the ministry of communications or PTT. Another problem is the serious hinderance to the rapid transmission of televised news reports from remote sites caused by the bureaucratic requirement that TV news crews must use PTT equipment.

Even if the TV news crew has their own satellite uplink dish or "fly away terminal" (FAT), they still have to get PTT permission to use their own equipment. They also must have a ministry of communications or PTT representative present at remote news sites for satellite transmissions of news events, even when their own engineer is present. We wish to strongly support the comments made earlier by Mr. David Nicholas, Chairman of Independent Television News in the U.K. He pointed out how easy it is to transmit TV news feeds by satellite in the United States, in comparison with the cumbersome system of clearances in the U.K.

I should note in this regard that the London office of Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS) News Operations told me that the U.K. is perhaps the easiest country in Europe in which to operate Fly-Away Terminals. CBS has two such units in Europe: one in London and one in Brussels. Two other major American

television news companies--American Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) and National Broadcasting Corporation (NBC)--do not keep a single FAT unit in Europe, even though their FAT units in New York are approved by both Intelsat and Eutelsat. They are unable to use them in Europe because bureaucratic obstacles make their rapid deployment impossible. We should regard portable FAT units or up-link satellite dishes as the modern equivalent of the reporter's telephone, and should remove all cumbersome restrictions on their use.

Another area of concern to us is the imposition of quantitative restrictions on imported audio-visual products. These restrictions are another serious impediment to greater flow of information.

A major hinderance to the increased flow of information, whether printed or audio-visual, between East and West is the non-convertibility of East Bloc currencies. We think it would be useful to discuss all of the various mechanisms that have been, or could be, devised to deal with this problem. These are such things as barter exchanges, o'f-set arrangements, and non-convertible national currency accounts for local income and expenses which Americans have used in some countries.

Mr. Chairman, in closing we would like to express our strong support for the statements made by the ITU Secretary General last week, and the Polish and Soviet delegations this afternoon, on the need for greater standardization and interconnectivity in telecommunications for television and data transmissions. These technical requirements are essential to increasing the flow of information between East and West.

0061v1-7

U.S. Delegation to the CSCE Information Forum

Some Principles for the New Age of Information Technology
Submitted by Leonard Sussman
Senior Scholar in International Communications
Freedom House, New York
Subsidiary Working Body C

Earlier over-arching changes in human societies are known as the Agricultural Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, and most recently the Communication Revolution. Dramatic as each was, that with the widest global impact, occurring in by far the shortest time-span and affecting all of humanity most profoundly, will be the Information Revolution.

It may be technically known as the Age of ISDN -- the Integrated Systems of Digital Networks -- the universal networking of networks of all kinds: news, information, data, history, culture, entertainment; by sound and picture; conveyed by small and large technologies mainly over telephone lines linking people to people everywhere.

This revolution will empower the individual citizen as never before, in all societies whatever their social or political structure. The Age of ISDN will be a democratizing force motored by technology, but not restricted by the application of technology. We need not fear an Orwellian outcome in which communication machines either subvert the words of men and women or hold them hostage to the technocrat at some central authority.

The Age of ISDN -- the linkage of communication technology at the service of humanity everywhere -- will be based on the mind of men and women controlling the machine as a human right. For a solemn commitment of the CSCE's Final Act as of Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is to advance the free flow of information, by word and image, across national borders and within all societies.

The technology of the Age of ISDN is the instrument of that commitment. ISDN should be seen as a vast array of switching points worldwide. Those switches will direct the flow of all kinds of news and information from one point to another no matter how distant. But that flow must be unimpeded by political or bureaucratic controls. Put positively (as I believe we can these days) we, in all countries, must develop the political will to allow technology to drive social change without impediments.

Some broad guidelines may be useful. There should be:

1. A commitment to provide the basic technology that will put everyone, everywhere on line. That means providing telephones and terminals within easy access and at affordable cost. The International Telecommunication Union (ITU) has set the goal of having everyone on earth near a telephone by early in the 21st century. This includes all Third World countries. Surely all CSCE nations can meet that objective.

2. Universal compatability of ISDN services is a human right. Small and large communication instruments should be able to speak to one another no matter where they are created or deployed. Only open architecture of computers, television receivers (including high definition T.V.), and, most important, telephones can provide universal access to all digital systems. This means inter-regional as well as regional standardization and compatibility. Commercial or political competition should not block access to communications from other regions, either by incompatible technology or tariffs. To provide diverse news and information at lowest cost worldwide, for example, there should be developed an integrated packet of video, audio, and data services having universal application. All news suppliers, particularly those originating in the developing world, should have ready access to such integrated packets. This is in compliance not only with the Vienna Concluding Document, but all fundamental declarations and convenents in the field of human rights.

3. Technology should drive politics. The philosophy of openness and of the individual's right to communication -- certainly to the extent envisioned in the Age of ISDN -- will be an extention of present political and civil rights in some countries, and more innovative in other countries. No nation, however, can avoid making social, political, and even legislative adjustments to the new age. But these adjustments should be mainly to guarantee openness and diversity of content, and avoidance of monopoly control of the carriers. While legislation may be needed to deregulate present governmental monolopies of communication, legislation should be limited only to ensure that new monopolies, of whatever form, do not appear. There should be deregulation to free the flow of content and regulation only to ensure the maintenance of diversity.

4. Not only technology, but human rights should drive the politics of the Age of ISDN. I have noted earlier at this conference that the Vienna Concluding Document of the CSCE called for information "of all kinds" to be accessible to all citizens. That means unofficial as well as official

information; independent views and criticism as well as governmental dicta and indoctrination. That calls for independent, non-governmental journalists and information processors. No nation can fulfill its commitment to the CSCE Process without enabling independent journalists and information processors to work in freedom without prior or post-censorship, and without fear of reprisal or worse.

I am submitting several proposals to advance these guidelines. I have recently completed a book on these subjects that will be published in the fall of 1989. It is called Power, the Press and the Technology of Freedom: The Coming Age of ISDN. It is an optimistic book.

I recognize that these recommendations will require readjustment of political and informational relationships in some countries. But the consensual commitment to CSCE requires no less. The exhilirating possibilities for human freedom and national progress, to which the Age of ISDN beckons us, will be ample reward.

U.S. Delegation to the CSCE Information Forum

Statement Issued by the U.S. Delegation
to the CSCE Information Forum
London, May 12, 1989

The London Information Forum represents a significant benchmark in the CSCE process. It is the first CSCE meeting devoted specifically to information issues and to the commitments espoused in the Helsinki, Madrid and Vienna documents. These commitments establish agreed standards for the conduct of participating states in strengthening and expanding the free flow of information. Our purpose in coming here was to identify areas where improvement of implementation was needed and to explore practical means of achieving this. We believe that our candor and forthright approach contributed to this end.

The basis of our approach was the idea that people have a right to knowledge and to freedom of choice in information. To that end we suggested and won the agreement to open these deliberations to the media and private sector representatives.

Much of the discussion focused on working conditions for journalists. We also examined how other forms of communication can be improved among and within countries. Though the bulk of restrictions on the free flow of information are politically inspired, some result from bureaucratic impediments.

Many proposals submitted by members of participating states' delegations address these issues. We will study these proposals carefully between now and Helsinki. In addition to these approaches, we believe that governments can arrive at ways to eliminate obstacles and expand free information flow by conferring bilaterally. Bilateral information discussions drawing on the private sector are an effective means to widening communications between the citizens of the CSCE states.

Other gains made at the Forum include:

-- receptivity, in principle, by the Soviet Union and some other Eastern countries to redirect inconvertible sales proceeds from informational material (earned by hard currency countries) to defray in-country business expenses of Western firms;

-- statements of support from some CSCE countries to reduce administrative restrictions on the general use of television receive-only satellite dishes and journalists' use of satellite uplink terminals for remote-site news gathering.

In response to much discussion about delays in most CSCE states regarding issuance of journalist visas and burdensome travel restrictions, Ambassador Leonard H. Marks will recommend to the Secretary of State that the U.S. take a fresh look at our own policies in this field.

The U.S. delegation expresses its appreciation to the CSCE Secretariat staff and Her Majesty's Government for the outstanding arrangements and gracious hospitality that have so effectively assisted our work here.

○